

REMARKS

Applicants' attorney thanks Examiner for the careful consideration given to this application. The matters raised in the action are discussed below in the same order as presented by the Examiner.

As suggested in paragraph 1 of the action, the specification has been amended to include appropriate headings. The specification now conforms to US practice style.

The objection noted in paragraph 2 of the action is rendered moot by cancellation of claim 7. Further, proper antecedent basis is provided for all recitations in the claims now presented for the Examiner's consideration.

Prior to discussing the rejections of the claims, the claim amendments are initially discussed below. For convenience of amendment, prior claims 1 - 12 are cancelled in favor of newly present the claims 13 - 26. Independent claims 13 and 20 are similar to prior independent claim 7, but present additional structural and functional detail to clarify the operation of the nonwoven production machine.

Independent claims 13 and 20 each define a nonwoven production machine including alternate path and pathways along which a web from a spun bond tower may be directed for different processing. That is, the processing may be

provided by one or more of first and second waterjet consolidation units or a calendar in accordance with the selected path and/or pathway. In this manner, processing of a web produced by a single feed to the spun bond tower may be selected to form nonwoven of different grades corresponding with the selected processing as described at page 1, lines 17-20 of the specification. The web is subsequently directed to an application unit for final processing to provide the finished nonwoven.

Turning to the action on the merits, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,879,170 to Radwanski et al. ("Radwanski") in view of US 6,321,425 to Putnam et al. ("Putnam"). The amended claims overcome the rejection by positively claiming both pathways so as to enable alternative processing in the single nonwoven production machine. There is no suggestion of alternative pathways in Radwanski or Putnam in a single nonwoven production machine. Moreover, there is no suggestion contained within the references themselves as to the placement of the Putnam calendar in the combined teachings of the cited references to enable nonwovens with or without waterjet consolidation depending upon the selected pathway.

The addition of the teachings in US 4,623,575 to Brooks et al. ("Brooks") relating to expressing means do not remedy the foregoing deficiencies of the Radwanski and Putnam teachings.

US 7,500,293 to Noelle, US 2001/0005926 to Noelle and US 2002/0168910 to Vuillaume et al., cited as being of interest but not applied, do not teach or suggest nonwoven production machines including different path and pathways for selected processing of webs from a single feed to the spun bond tower to form nonwoven of different grades.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 13-26 presently of record are patentably distinguished over the art and are in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees required by this communication, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. CAB-40202.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Joseph J. Corso, Reg. No. 25845

1801 East Ninth Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108

(216) 579-1700

November 10, 2009